

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>GROENEVELD TRANSPORT EFFICIENCY, INC.</b>	)	CASE NO. 1:10-CV-00702
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
	)	
v.	)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	)	WILLIAM H. BAUGHMAN, JR.
	)	
<b>LUBECORE INTERNATIONAL, INC.</b>	)	<b>PLAINTIFF GROENEVELD TRANSPORT</b>
	)	<b>EFFICIENCY, INC.'S MEMORANDUM IN</b>
	)	<b>OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S</b>
Defendant.	)	<b>MOTION <i>IN LIMINE</i> TO EXCLUDE</b>
	)	<b>REPORT AND TESTIMONY BY DR.</b>
	)	<b>MAJID RASHIDI</b>

Defendant Lubecore International, Inc. ("Defendant") asserts in its Motion *in Limine* to Exclude the Report and Testimony by Dr. Majid Rashidi that Dr. Rashidi's testimony should be prohibited as it is offered to rebut the testimony of a fact witness. However, a great deal of Martin Vermeulen's testimony presents expert opinion, not fact testimony, and as such it is completely appropriate to rebut that testimony with an expert. "We are aware of no case that suggests a party is precluded from calling a rebuttal expert when the opposing party admits his "expert" testimony through a lay witness, and we decline to impose such a rule now." Konvitz v. Midland Walwyn Capital, Inc., 129 Fed. Appx. 344, 347 (9th Cir. 2005).

Mr. Vermeulen is an engineer who was engaged by Defendant to create Defendant's product at issue in this action. Defendant seeks to present Mr. Vermeulen's testimony at trial by video deposition, taken within the last weeks just before trial.

But, Defendant does not present Mr. Vermeulen to testify as a fact witness regarding his design of the Lubecore product. Rather, Defendant seeks to present through Mr. Vermeulen

expert assessments and opinions about the function and functionality of the Groeneveld EP0 product.

Mr. Vermeulen worked for Groeneveld over thirty years ago. He now testifies to some fact matters to which he has first-hand knowledge, but most of his testimony seeks to present expert testimony regarding the current Groeneveld product.

(page 10)

7 Q. Are you currently employed, Mr.  
8 Vermeulen?

9 A. I am self-employed.

10 Q. And what do you do in your  
11 self-employment?

12 A. I design products for the  
13 automotive industry on a freelance basis, and I  
14 have a partnership with a Korean company called  
15 Taesung. And for them I develop automotive  
16 products, and I am responsible for export  
17 sales, and "export" means outside Korea.

18 Q. Is the business of Taesung totally  
19 automotive parts?

20 A. Yes, they are. Automotive and  
21 heavy machinery equipment. We are what is  
22 called or known in the industry as an "OEM"  
23 supplier. And "OEM" stands for "original  
24 equipment manufacturer".

(pages 11-12)

16 Q. Do any of your responsibilities  
17 today involve automated lubrication systems?

18 A. Yes, sir, it does.

19 Q. In what sense?

20 A. In Taesung, we are a producer of  
21 automated lubricating system parts, and I am  
22 designing and developing engineering systems  
23 for various brands of automated lubricating  
24 systems around the world.

25 Q. Can you give us an idea of what  
1 brands you do that for?

2 A. Oh, there are quite a lot. Most  
3 popular names is Ciaponi, Lincoln, EE,  
4 Lubecore, BEKA-MAX. There are dozens and  
5 dozens of companies in the automotive industry,  
6 lubricating systems. \*\*\*

(page 21)

7 Q. Why does the base of the new pump  
8 that your team engineered for Groeneveld have  
9 the irregular shape it does?

10 A. The irregular shape is more or less  
11 determined by the function of the parts that  
12 are in it. When you make a product of  
13 aluminium, the price of aluminium is in effect  
14 the highest cost price of the pump, highest  
15 part price of the pump. So you want to keep  
16 every single gram of aluminium. You want to  
17 take out that you don't need. What you see in  
18 the picture is that the round shape is actually  
19 following the round piston, and the four  
20 straight columns are there to hold the bolts  
21 that connect the bottom ceiling part to the  
22 main body on the front, the valves that you  
23 see. If you want to make it look nice, you  
24 make it square or round, or you give it a nice  
25 design. \*\*\*

(page 22)

5 Q. Why is the base the thickness it  
6 is?

7 A. There's reasons, technical reasons  
8 for that. If you make it thicker, that's  
9 rather silly, because you're spending money on  
10 something that's not supposed to be there.  
11 When you make it thinner, you have a serious  
12 risk that the pressure inside makes the body  
13 burst. And that's definitely something you  
14 don't want, for safety reasons.

15 Q. Would it have cost more to  
16 manufacture this pump if it had had a rounded  
17 aluminum alloy base to it?

18 MS. MICHELSON: Objection. Go  
19 ahead.

20 A. Yes. I would say that anything --  
21 if you take this particular body, if we --  
22 anything was changed on this body, any gram of  
23 material, wherever you would place it, that  
24 would make it more expensive.

(pages 24-25)

19 Q. Could the team have designed this  
20 pump with a square-shaped reservoir?

21 A. Yeah. Sure. We could have.

22 Q. Why didn't you?

23 A. Well, two reasons. First of all,  
24 in nature things are usually round, not square.

25 Square things are extremely difficult to seal.

1 And as you can see, we are using seals inside  
2 that pump and also a follower plate. Anything  
3 that you make square on the four corners is  
4 extremely difficult to close off, and it will  
5 leak eventually. That is one reason.

6 And the second reason, of course,  
7 is cost price. Square reservoirs, square  
8 rings, square seals are more expensive than  
9 round.

10 Q. Why is the reservoir on the top of  
11 the pump housing?

12 A. Mostly because of gravity. Gravity  
13 pulls things down. So if you put grease on the  
14 bottom of something and it drops down, you have  
15 to suck it up with a piston. That is  
16 technically difficult. And especially in  
17 wintertime, when grease is very stiff and cold,  
18 pistons usually do not have enough vacuum to  
19 suck up the grease. So it's only logic that  
20 you place grease on top of the piston. Then  
21 when the piston is sucking, gravity is helping  
22 to put the grease into the grease chamber. \*\*\*

(pages 26-27)

12 Q. In engineering this pump, was one  
13 of the team's goals to make a nice-looking  
14 pump?

15 A. Well, if you look at the pump, that  
16 answers for itself. The thing is ugly. It's  
17 designed to do a function. If we were to make  
18 it nice, I would have given it a nice plastic  
19 cover, made some nice features on it. This  
20 thing is purely functional.

21 Q. In engineering this pump, was one  
22 of the team's goals to make it look distinctive  
23 in any way?

24 MS. MICHELSON: I'm going to  
25 object. Excuse me. Excuse me --

1 A. The only thing that we did was make  
2 it work. And the way it looks now is simply a  
3 result of engineering. And we never had any  
4 idea to make it look in any particular way.

5 It's just engineered the way it is.

6 Q. Is there anything fanciful about  
7 the configuration of the Groeneveld pump that  
8 your team engineered?

9 A. No. Not really.

10 Q. Is there anything arbitrary about  
11 the configuration of the pump that your team  
12 engineered for Groeneveld?

13 A. No. I don't think so.

(pages 39-40)

22 A. Yes. I think it's fair to say that  
23 it's a complete new generation.

24 Q. Why is that?

25 A. Well, there has been 30 years in  
1 between, and a new generation, new materials,  
2 new technical perspectives, a new fresh way at  
3 looking things. That is, in my opinion, worth  
4 calling it a "new generation".

As Mr. Vermeulen is being presented to offer expert and opinion testimony on functionality and distinctiveness of the Groeneveld product at issue in this case, it is fully appropriate that Groeneveld be permitted to present rebuttal including expert testimony. Otherwise, in the alternative, Mr. Vermeulen's testimony must be excluded.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Deborah J. Michelson

DEBORAH J. MICHELSON (0059044)

DAVID A. KUNSELMAN (0073980)

STEVEN J. MILLER (0014293)

MILLER GOLER FAEGES LLP

1301 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 2700

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1835

(Phone) 216-696-3366 • (Fax) 216-363-5835

Michelson@MillerGolerFaeges.com

Kunselman@MillerGolerFaeges.com

Miller@MillerGolerFaeges.com

***Counsel for Plaintiff***

***Groeneveld Transport Efficiency, Inc.***

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 13, 2011, the foregoing document was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's system.

/s/ Deborah J. Michelson

DEBORAH J. MICHELSON (0059044)